City of Raleigh
RFP 274-PU-101
Implementation Services for Customer Care & Billing 2.2 Upgrade
Addendum 1
All questions submitted for Pre-Proposal Conference

The questions below were received from interested vendors on or before the deadline of 5/11/16. We have answered each briefly and to the best of our ability. More discussion may be necessary for certain questions at the pre-proposal meeting as well as further follow-up with other appropriate City departments.

1. Do you have contract requirements related to Limit of Liability?
   Reference attachment City_of_Raleigh_Contract_Template

2. Do you plan to go-live in production with the Phase 1 technical upgrade before completing Phase 2 functional enhancements and modifications?
   Yes that is the plan

3. Are Upgrade Partners bidding only on Phase 1 at this time or a combined Phase 1 and 2? Proposers should bid on both phases combined. If combined, is the functionality limited to the functional/technical upgrade fit gap items or is the City expecting a full fit gap analysis? We are not expecting a full fit gap analysis but it will necessary to review, discuss and agreed to the fit gap items. However, if the proposer is knowledgeable of any existing gaps, the City expects sharing of that information. Would it be the City's intent for additional scope identified in the fit gap sessions to be addressed through a change control process? Yes

4. Can you please confirm in Section 1.2 that the City is currently running v2.2 Web Self Service and will not be making any changes to the current version or upgrading WSS? The version of Web Self Service is v2.2. It has been customized. Is the scope to simply ensure WSS still works with the upgraded version of CC&B? Yes in phase 1. Phase 2 has additional functionality. Is implementing Oracle's Customer Self Service product possibly in scope? We currently have not purchased Oracle's Self Service product.

5. Can the city provide the inventory of "as is" business processes documented and an example of the documentation? That will be provided during the project. We have 70+ processes documented.

6. In section 8.4.9, the city requires the Upgrade Partner to test all changes and supply documentation. Is this testing considered unit testing or system testing? Unit testing of all development. In the testing section it states, "The Upgrade Partner shall be responsible and lead the City in all testing activities including planning, writing test scripts, provide testing support, and document testing results and status in all phases," but goes on to state that the City and Upgrade Partner will both be responsible. Often, the client is responsible for testing activities and documentation and the upgrade partner would advise which helps limit the overall cost for the engagement. Can you clarify the Upgrade Partner and City's respective roles in testing? Expectation is the Upgrade Partner perform all unit testing and deliver all documentation and test results. The City is responsible for integration testing, UAT, and all documentation and results related to that; however Upgrade Partner shall be responsible for assisting and leading the process. The Upgrade Partner shall be responsible for defect or testing failures (fixes) from UAT or integration testing. The Upgrade Partner shall manage the complete testing timeline.

7. Does the City envision creating a new set of training materials or modifying existing training materials? Modify existing and augmenting with new if necessary.

8. Does the City want its training to be targeted only to changes or be more a comprehensive "re-training" of its user base? Targeted training for changes. In the Training Plan section it states all aspects of training. This is more consistent with the scope of an implementation and may be more costly than an upgrade. Is this the City's desire? Training for changes only.

9. Providing a training resource to sit in all training classes could add significant costs beyond the typical upgrade. Would the City be open to other options? Yes, open to options.

10. The upgrade partner is responsible for developing the Change Management plan. Is the City responsible for executing it? Yes, that is the expectation at this time.

11. Do you have an estimated budget in mind for the engagement? No

12. Could you please provide a little information on how the City is viewed by its customer base? Need clarification of question.

13. Section 1 states the application supports meter inventory, does this only include active meters in use or are replacement/stock meters maintained in CC&B as well? Includes in stock meter inventory

14. Section 1 states there are 260+ active CC&B users; could you provide a rough breakdown of the number of users from the customer center, back office, IT support, etc., perspective? Roughly there are 275 users. Basic/rough breakdown = 137 inquiry, 36 Customer Service, 11 back office billing, 27 field/meters, 16 IT/technical, Testing 8

15. Are there any current challenges or issues the City is encountering with Automic (UC4) v8? Currently there are no known issues. What is the current nightly batch duration? Nightly batch averages 6.5 hours

16. What are the city's expectations around post production support after phase 1? It is the City's expectation that the Upgrade Partner will be on site immediately after phase 1 completion for a minimum of ten business days and available for a minimum of 90 calendar days for break/fix. The expectation is phase 2 will be starting while phase 1 is transitioning to post go live stability (will be agreed upon during project planning stage).

17. When is the move of the primary data center location scheduled for? The City's data center is currently in migration.

18. Is there any middleware (SOA etc.) being used for integrations? Will the Upgrade Partner be responsible for installation/documentation of the Integrations Middleware? The City currently uses Red Hat JBoss Fuse for our middleware integrations with other software. Proposer is responsible for installing and documenting anything they build. If built on the City's Fuse framework proposer shall install the Fuse server. This should be discussed further in the meeting with appropriate CoR IT staff

19. Will the BI publisher upgrade also include Reports Design / Development? Due to changes in database schema, some reports may need to be changed. If yes, is there a list of reports that will be part of the upgrade? If changes are necessary, then yes the reports will need to be rewritten. Currently there are +/- 260 reports and a list will be provided during the projects.

20. Is there a library of test cases maintained from the previous implementation? The City has developed and maintained a testing library housing approximately 45% of test scenarios.

21. What is the version of HPQC/ALM that the city owns? 12.20

22. Is the selected upgrade partner expected to upgrade UC4 or to interface with the new upgraded version? The Upgrade Partner is expected to upgrade UC4 as part of the project.

23. Is the City planning on licensing new version of WSS (OUCSS) from Oracle? The City has not currently purchased Oracle's CSS.

24. Pg 4: Please provide the details of the Cityworks interface (language, architecture, etc). Is this interface to be considered in scope for pricing purposes? Yes, this is in scope.

    • New Cityworks web services for Cityworks communications to create, update cancel Work Orders - Custom code built in Microsoft dotNET 4.0.
    • Custom screen in Cityworks was built in Javascript.
    • CC&B outbound messages to Cityworks - CC&B Change Handler (Java), Business Objects, XAI Sender
    • CC&B inbound receipt of Cityworks data - CC&B Custom XAI Service (Java).
    • Middleware for endpoint communication, data transformation and business logic was built in Java using the Jboss Switchyard Framework

25. Pg 15: 4.8.2: Please provide details regarding anticipated PeopleSoft licensing. Need clarification of question (may be discussed in pre-proposal conference).

26. 4.8.4: refers to a review of current Oracle licensing requirements and maintenance costs. Please clarify this need. The City's expectation is if there are any licensing and/or maintenance additional costs for phase 1 or 2 of this project, they should be included in the proposal pricing.

27. Pg 17: Section 8.1.4 Please provide the current performance statistics/characteristics associated with the hourly and nightly batch windows per job executed. Currently there are no known issues. Batch currently completes in an average of 6.5 hours. Hourly batch completes in approximately 10 minutes. Refer to attachments for a list of job executed.

28. Section 8.1.4.4 Please provide the current statistics/characteristics associated with application page loading. Currently page load times average less than one second except for large customers with +100 accounts. The City's business practice is one account per premise.

29. Section 8.1.4.6 How is tracking effort collected and reported on the current process? Please provide current reports. There are no reports currently and tracking is manual. We will discuss further in the mandatory pre-proposal conference. Validation is performed.

30. Section 8.2.4 How many years of data are to be converted? It is the City's intention to convert all data currently in CCB. What is the current quality of the data to be converted? Very good. Are there current issues with financial balancing between the financial systems and CC&B? No

31. Section 8.3.2 Please provide the City's standards. We've requested additional info and can discuss in meeting

32. Section 8.3.3 Please clarify the types and amount of assistance required. We've requested additional info and can discuss in meeting

33. Section 8.3.7 Are these services within scope of this effort of to be part of the separate support operational scope? This is within scope of this project.

34. Section 8.3.8b: What services are within scope related to the City's network environment? Need clarification of question (may be discussed in pre-proposal conference).

35. Section 8.4.2: Please confirm level of effort and costs impacts attributed to future identified fit/gap are outside the scope and pricing of this proposal. Need clarification of question (may be discussed in pre-proposal conference).

36. Section 8.6.7: Please clarify the types and amount of assistance required. This is to be determined during the project.

37. Section 8.8: What is the status of current test scripts? The City has developed and maintained a testing library housing approximately 45% of test scenarios. Are they current and available for reuse? Test scripts are current and available. However, there is system functionality that has not been retested since go-live and those test scripts will need to be developed (i.e. meter upload).

38. Section 8.8.11: Does the city currently utilize an automated test tool? No If so, which tool(s)? Are automated test scripts currently available for reuse?

39. Section 8.13.1: What is the current state of 3-way financial balancing? Perfect

40. Section 9.1.5: What is the anticipated scope of change for each of these interfaces? This is to be determined during the project. What is the technology associated to each? Need clarification of question (may be discussed in pre-proposal conference).

41. Section 9.2: Will a dedicated conversion environment exist for the project? Yes

42. Section 9.2: Please provide copies of all relevant computer and networking policies to be compliant with. This may be provided by IT during the project.

43. Section 12: Please confirm hardware to be priced to exclude servers, networking equipment, etc. which is to be provided by the city. Need clarification of question (may be discussed in pre-proposal conference).

44. Section 1.2 of RFP states City's PM will be responsible for guiding the overall project and that City will be responsible for scope, schedule and deliverables. Please elaborate on the role of the City's Project Manager vs expectation of System Integrator PM. Unable to locate reference to this in section 1.2.

45. Please expand upon how the City and Vendor will work together to stay within budget on the project The Upgrade Partner should have previous experience executing a technical and functional CCB 2.5 or higher upgrade. They shall provide a thorough project plan that ensures the project stays in scope, has realistic timelines, and provide properly skilled resources. Based on this project plan, the City will allocate agreed upon resources to assist in all phases of the project.

46. Are you open to an offshore option for development with City having visibility and approval authority? Or do the resources have to be onsite 80% of the time. Only if it is agreed upon in advance by the City for one-off situations.

47. Please elaborate on the not-to-exceed price. Section 12 states City will be responsible for the scope, schedule and deliverables. Is the intent to have time and material contract with not to exceed? Unable to locate reference of City being responsible for the scope, schedule and deliverables in Section 12.

48. 1.1 – Target CC&B2.5+ - May we request that the City of Raleigh determine and freeze the target CC&B release before the "not to exceed" dollars are finalized in the contract? Even if a different release is targeted for Phase 1 vs. Phase 2, we believe having the target CC&B release(s) known

will enable the lowest "not to exceed" price possible and the best apples-to-apples vendor comparison.   We anticipate phase 1 will be 2.5 however phase 2 may include versions of 2.5. Much depends on timing.

49. 1.1 - PCI compliance - We would like to better understand the vendor responsibilities related to PCI compliance. For example, is the vendor responsible to research, demonstrate, and create "submittable" documentation for PCI compliance as part of the upgrade scope for the Phase 1 technical upgrade, or was PCI compliance simply mentioned in the RFP as one of the drivers for upgrading CC&B? The vendor shall be responsible for ensuring all development and applications are in compliance with current PCI standards.

50. 1.2 - Web Self Service scope – For the technical upgrade, we want to confirm that the scope is to make the integration touchpoints to CC&B transparent to the existing Web Self Service application built on the CC&B 2.2 sample code. In other words, no code or "look and feel" changes would be required of Raleigh to the front end self-service application. We only expect changes to WSS during the technical upgrade (phase 1) if required to maintain current functionality. Phase 2 would require changes and enhancements to the current WSS functionality.

51. 2. Timeline - Is there an approximate start date for the project, and/or a window we can assume? No, this is dependent on contract negotiation and routing process/timeline.

52. 4.4.3 – Outsourcing Development and On Call Support - Will the response to this section be a scored element in the selection process or informational only. It is not a specific scoring element, however, overall experience providing development support on an as-needed basis will be considered.

53. 4.8.2 – Pricing – Please confirm the vendor is not responsible for providing the price of the applications themselves, just the professional services involving the base components of CC&B, UC4, and BI Publisher AND interface components. Need clarification of question. For example if the Proposer is aware of additional costs to upgrade UC4, BiP, etc it shall be included as part of the cost (may be discussed in pre-proposal conference).

54. 4.8.3 - Monetary penalty – Is it up to the Vendor to suggest specific monetary incentives/penalties related to our proposed deliverables and milestones or at this time is it simply required for us to explicitly acknowledge that there will be penalties negotiated prior to final selection/contract award based on the timeline and milestones for Phase 1 and Phase 2? This is simply for your acknowledgement. If this is part of your typical, standard method of approach include in that part of your proposal.

55. 4.8.4 – Oracle CC&B Licensing Review. Please elaborate on expected output of the review, and if possible provide a manifest of what is currently assumed to be the CC&B licensing and maintenance for the upgrade project?

CSI	Oracle Product Description	Term	License Type	# of Licenses	License Level
15919582	Oracle Utilities Customer Care and Billing Standard Edition Resid	30-May-15 to 29-May-16	Customer Perpetual	1800	Full Use
15919582	Oracle Utilities Customer Care and Billing Business Intelligence S	30-May-15 to 29-May-16	Customer Perpetual	1	Full Use

56. 8.1.4 – Are all metrics stated in this section currently achieved in production with the hardware and batch job stream assumptions stated in the RFP? The only exception is the nightly batch is currently averaging 6.5 hours.
57. 8, 8.1.2, 8.4.1 – Please clarify the depth and timing of Fit/Gap sessions desired for Phase 1 (if any) vs. Phase 2.   After a review of the Fit/Gap attachment file compared to the Section 8 descriptions, we were not sure if the Fit Gap scope should be confined to the attachment areas (first Tab being for Phase 1 sessions and the second tab being for Phase 2) or broader in nature. The fit gap spreadsheet documents known gaps that should be addressed in phase 1 or phase 2. This is not necessarily all inclusive and the vendor shall provide identification and solutions for unknown gaps.   And is there any preference for having all Fit-Gaps for both phases done once up front? We are open to recommendations from proposers for best practices. However, our assumptions were to separate.
58. 8 – Please elaborate on any new security requirements (e.g. field level security for users vs. customer information security) and how this may or may not relate to PCI compliance. The City's PCI compliance program may require additional security (i.e. field level, data base, application interfaces, etc).   The upgrade partner shall be aware of PCI compliance requirements that may impact any part of the upgrade project and provide solutions to ensure security standards are met.
59. 8.2.1 – Project and Team Collaboration Tool – Is there any State Licensed tool of preference? Not to our knowledge but this can be discussed during the pre-proposal conference (the City's IT Project Management Team may have a preference). Can defect tracking be contained in this tool and/or would automated integration with Quality Center be a plus? We are open to recommendations to most effectively and efficiently track all project components.
60. 8.3.2 – Database Installation – What participation by City DBA's should be assumed for the project during the various phases and for the various CC&B environments? We've requested additional info and can discuss in meeting.
61. 8.3.5/8.6.7 - Streaming Disaster recovery - Are there any models or preferred vendors for this at Raleigh for other mission critical applications, for which the policies and procedures can be shared? We've requested additional info and can discuss in meeting.
62. 8.3.5 – Separate production reporting environment – Please expand on "as is" and Phase 2 requirements for this – i.e. the # of minutes the reporting environment is behind production and the refresh timing/technology method, availability of CC&B front end, etc. We've requested additional info and can discuss in meeting.
63. Phase 2 - Fit Gap 4185 (Citiworks Interface) – Regarding the reference to JBOSS/Service Bus, can you elaborate on requirements and/or a preferred interface approach? Also does Raleigh have any preferred installed middleware licenses or middle vendor licenses available via State Contract? We've requested additional info and can discuss in meeting.
64. Phase 2 – Fit Gap 4097 (Web Self Service) – Recognizing there are alternative architectures and tools for the Phase 2 Web Self Service, does the vendor scope for this requirement include the user-facing pages and associated forms, or is the scope confined to explicit web services or other well defined API/middleware interface points to CC&B, that support each of listed Fit Gap requirements? We've requested additional info and can discuss in meeting.